

Vermont



AND STATE JOURNAL.

E. P. WALTON AND SON, PUBLISHERS.

MONTPELIER, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1836.

VOL. XXX, NO. 12...WHOLE NO. 1573.

Vermont State Journal.

For the Watchman and Journal.

THE —— PARTY.

As the party which has now been dormant for nearly eight years, is about either to lose or change its head; and as there appears to be, especially at this time, some little confusion in the mode of designating it, would there not be a propriety in now agreeing upon some name, whereby to distinguish said party both for the present and a future time? —

So far, in our country, this party is unique; if it bears no resemblance to any that has heretofore existed.

It is compounded of parties of all other parties—the ultra advocates and opposers of every political principle, in relation to which two opinions have prevailed in this country, and the pros and cons in relation to every measure of national importance which has been of late years suggested.

Made up originally of the most discordant materials, the party never has had, and with eight years of party drilling, has not now, any thing like a political bond of union.

Just at this time the fear of having the rotation principle brought to bear upon the hundred thousand office holders, is the strongest, and almost the only ligament, that holds the party together.

Originally, and until of late, the man Andrew Jackson was, and has been, the sole rallying point,

and the sole bond of union, of the party in question.

If every portion of this party has at different times played the jilt, some towards one

class of our republican institutions or principles, and some towards others, they have all

preserved their fidelity to Gen. Jackson.—

Touched with the fondstone of office, and imbued with the popular admiration of military renown, they have with unerring precision, pointed their noses towards the magnetic pole of their party, during the whole period of its eccentric and zigzag flights through nearly every sign of the political zodiac.

What, then, can be a more appropriate permanent designation, than that of the "Jackson party"? There

is no more propriety in terming this party the "Van Buren party" as many do, than there would

be in calling the old democratic party, the "Jefferson party," or the "Madison party."

It matters not whether or no Mr. Van Buren receives all the vote of the Jackson party, he is

the candidate of that party only—not of a new and distinct party—and will receive the vote of no other party.

He has avowed himself a political disciple of Gen. Jackson, who, by the

way, is remarkable for not having, and never

having had, any settled political creed whatsoever.

It is hardly fair, neither is it strictly

correct, to call it the "tory party." First, because the term is particularly offensive to the

party, and secondly, because that party contains a considerable number of theoretical democrats.

And although General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren are the greatest practical nullifiers in the union, it would not be proper to term them the "Nullifying party," because as a party, it is theoretically opposed to the doctrine of Nullification.

Again, then, I ask, what name, can be more descriptive and proper than the one proposed?

It was the former recommend of being probably the least displeasing to the party in question, of any which its opponents can accord to it.

As for the clamorous pretension of the Jackson party to democracy, it is too amusing, laughable, ridiculous, absurd and preposterous, to require confutation.

For this wonderful production: and that from the hour of its birth she has clasped it to her bosom with all the ardor and all the

fondness of a mother's love.—This may be true, Sir, and being true, it would be daring

to presume in us to offer the least indignity to the dear creature.

We are further informed, Sir, that the democracy of Vermont are adopting, or are willing to

adopt, the New York *darling*, and make it

their nursing, and even a test question of

political orthodoxy.

This, Sir, I do not and cannot believe; that certain individuals of the democratic party in this state have

advocated the adoption of such a measure

is true, but I believe, Sir, that this project

has not yet been sufficiently examined to form a part of the political creed of any party.

If I have a correct view of Vermont

democracy, such a proposition can never

find favor or acceptance in their estimation,

I believe, Sir, that the democratic party

have ever been the first to advocate a well

balanced government; they have ever con-

sidered it all important, that the different

branches of the government should be kept

separate and distinct from, and independent

of, each other: they have ever been the

ready advocates and vigilant guardians

of the rights of the people.

But, Sir, they have never been, and I trust they never

will become, the advocates of mobocracy.

I hope, Sir, that no party in our state will

ever become so infatuated through execu-

tive love of the people, as to wish the legisla-

ture to assume and exercise a power,

which can, with infinitely more propriety

and safety, be administered by a different

branch of the government.

We are invited to adopt the proposed amendment,

because it is said that the charter, in its

present form, may be brought into connec-

tion with the political affairs of the state.

This suggestion, if well founded, is worthy

of serious consideration, and the event antici-

pated should by all means be avoided.

But I would enquire, Sir, is not the remedy

proposed infinitely worse than the evil com-

plained of? Are we not receiving into our

bosoms the very viper we wish to avoid?

Adopt the amendment, and you may claim

the honor of having created one of the most

perfect political engines that was ever fram-

ed by the ingenuity of man.

The banks, instead of being a peaceable, quiet, business

institution, entirely and exclusively devoted

to its own affairs, will be forced into politi-

cally, and they may produce a result, which we

ought all, with one accord, to depurate.

Swell the number of your banks to forty,

place them all at the mercy of the legisla-

ture, subject them, as you unavoidably

must, to the caprice and bitterness of party

spirit, and where will be the circulating me-

dium of your state? What will be its stand-

ing at home and abroad? What will hereaf-

ter be the character of your legislatures?

And what the fate of all the important busi-

ness transactions of the state? An answer

to these inquiries will be readily suggested

to the mind of every member of the senate,

and I think we shall all agree, that the ad-

option of such a measure might, and proba-

bly would be, in a high degree, disastrous

to the best interests of the state.

I will now invite your attention, Sir, for a

few moments, to the charter in its present

form. The bill on your table is, in sub-

stance, the same as all the other bank char-

ters in the state.—It clearly defines, on the

one hand, the rights and privileges of the

corporators; and on the other, it sets forth

with equal clearness and certainty, the du-

ties to be by them performed, and the enjoy-

ment of those immunities is made to de-

pend entirely upon the performance of those

duies. It would seem, Sir, to us who

have seen such machinery in operation for

the last twenty or thirty years, and who

have witnessed the almost unrivaled pros-

perity of the State during that period, that

there can be no danger in passing the bill.

But it is said, Sir, and urged as the prin-

pal objection to the bill in its present form,

that there may hereafter be political com-

bination formed by the different Banks

through the State, and that the liberty of

the people may thereby be greatly endan-

gered. In answer to this objection, I say

Sir, that banks in this state, can never be-

come political unless they are coerced into

politics by legislative quackery.

As to combination with a view to political influence,

I think we have nothing to fear from

such a measure, for the reason, that there

ever has been and always will be a colla-

ction of interests among those institutions.

If a combination of this description be ever

formed, it must be from the most impious

necessity and with view to self-preservation.

But for argument's sake, we will

suppose that for some unaccountable rea-

son, these soulless institutions may wish to

become political, and if you please, may have

an ardent desire to trample upon the libe-

ties of the people. Now, I ask, what can

they possibly effect? They are feeble

and powerless; they are isolated, solitary

creatures, possessed of no social or political

qualities, compelled from their very organi-

zation to stand entirely aloof from society,

but it may be said that corporations have

life and power, if banks have not; true, sir,

and it is also true that they are no more

likely to abuse power than other individu-

als; they have an interest in common with

ourselves, in the prosperity and welfare of

our common country.

But suppose the banks to have the power

and inclination to sacrifice the public inter-

ests for the private gain of a few individuals.

Then, Sir, I am inclined to believe that

it is the *bankers* who are to be blamed for

the *banking* system.

But, Sir, I am inclined to believe that

it is the *bankers* who are to be blamed for

the *banking* system.

But, Sir, I am inclined to believe that

it is the *bankers* who are to be blamed for